DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 365 UD 022 120

TITLE The Children's Hearings Project: Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Boston.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 24p.; Research operating funds came from the Ford Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, and the Florence V. Burden Foundation.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Arbitration; Case Studies; Child Abuse; Child Neglect; *Community Involvement; Court Role; *Family Problems; Parent Child Relationship; Referral; Social Services; *State Programs; Truancy
IDENTIFIERS *Children Hearings Project MA; Status Offenders

ABSTRACT

This report describes the development, organization, and activities of the Massachusetts Children's Hearings Project, an experimental program set up by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center in August, 1980 to help parents and children solve family problems through mediation. Based on the Scottish Children's Hearings System, the Massachusetts program was designed as an alternative to the usual practice of dealing with status offenders and child abuse/child neglect cases through adversarial court proceedings. The hearing project involves bringing family members into a forum at which a panel of community volunteers mediates in a cooperative effort to discuss problems and agree on solutions. The report describes the steps involved in arranging hearings for families referred to the project by courts, schools, and social service agencies; the selection and characteristics of panel members; the hearing and mediation process and the types of issues addressed at hearings; the referral process; and the general outcomes of cases referred to the project between May, 1981 and April, 1982. The results of the referrals indicate that families have responded favorably to mediation and are willing to take on the responsibilities that mediated agreements require. Some case histories and sample agreements are presented in the report. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218365

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Wixted

Children's Hearings Project

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTERIM REPORT

OF THE

CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT

MAY, 1982

The Children's Hearings Project
497 Cambridge Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141

A Program of The Massachusetts Advocacy Center

UD021120

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT
OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER

The Massachusetts Advocacy Center, established in 1973 as an outgrowth of the Task Force on Children Out of School, Inc., represents children's interests before state and local bodies which legislate, regulate and deliver human services to children. The center acts to strengthen progressive legislative mandates and to close the gap between those requirements and actual service delivery in the fields of education, juvenile justice and child health.

The Center operates as a nonprofit, tax exempt, independent public interest organization supported by contributions and foundations grants.

ADVISORY BOARD
to the
Children's Hearings Project

The Hon. John Cratsley
Judge, District Court of Massachusetts
Sanford Fox
Professor, Boston College Law School
Neil Houston
Executive Director, Crime & Justice Foundation
Daniel McGillis
Center for Criminal Justice, Harvard Law School
Frank Sander
Professor, Harvard Law School

STAFF

Sandra Wixted
Project Director

Althea Cali
Case Coordinator

Brian Harris
Case Coordinator

Ann Marie Rocheleau
Researcher

Patricia Bright
Administrative Assistant

Elizabeth W. Vorenberg
Project Supervisor
Deputy Director, Massachusetts Advocacy Center

Sally Merry
Research Supervisor
Professor, Wellesley College

INTRODUCTION

"I felt real good that Laureen had remembered certain feelings that I had," said Mrs. [redacted]. She and her 13-year-old daughter, Laureen, were referred by a probation officer to the Children's Hearings Project to see if Laureen's living situation could be settled out of court.

Laureen had lived away from home in four different places in nine months. Her current home was with her boyfriend's family. As a result of court action in a Care and Protection proceeding, Laureen was in the custody of the state's Department of Social Services which had approved the boyfriend's house as a foster home.

In order to change the focus of the court action--from the family to her child--Mrs. Smith filed a CHINS application in district court alleging that Laureen was a "stubborn child". At this point the probation officer referred the Smiths to the project. The social services worker concurred, hoping that the mediation offered would at least settle some problems relating to visitation.

As the mediation began, both mother and daughter appeared skeptical, untrusting and cool to each other. The mediators listened to their doubts about the feasibility of Laureen's return home. Not until the mediators met privately with each one, however, did some real feelings emerge.

Mrs. [redacted] worried about Laureen's friends, the boyfriend in particular, and how late she stayed out. Laureen in turn was surprised to find out how concerned her mother was. Both were willing to try weekend visits. The written agreement included arrangements for such visits, including Laureen's promise to arrange her own transportation and to be in by 10 p.m. Mrs. [redacted] agreed to do something special with Laureen each weekend, and both agreed to a second mediation.

The first two weekend visits went so well that both mother and daughter decided that Laureen should

move home at once. They made arrangements together for her school transfer. At the next court hearing the case was dismissed and custody was returned to Mrs. [redacted]. The Department of Social Services withdrew from the case.

One month after the first mediation, Mrs. [redacted] and Laureen returned to the Children's Hearings Project. The second mediation produced another written agreement outlining responsibilities relating to their new home life together. They left the project smiling and agreeing that mediation had helped them to talk to each other and to begin to solve their problems on their own.

----A Case History from the Children's Hearings Project

****

The Children's Hearings Project began operation in August, 1980 to test the applicability of the Scottish Children's Hearings System to children's cases in the Massachusetts courts. Since May, 1981 when the first referrals were received, the project has focused on families with children who allegedly have committed "status offenses" or where there are allegations of child abuse or neglect. An alternative to the court, the demonstration project incorporates both the Scottish model--in particular the use of community volunteers in a panel setting--and techniques of mediation developed in this country.

The project, sponsored by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center, a public interest agency which seeks to improve the lives of children, serves the communities within the jurisdiction of the Cambridge and Somerville District Courts.

During the period covered in this report, May 21, 1981, to April 1, 1982, 92 families participated in the project, almost two-thirds of whom were referred by the courts. Review of ten months of referrals to this experimental program indicates that mediation relating to parent and child conflict shows promise, and that the use of community volunteers has a significant impact on the parties involved in mediation.

A research grant from the W.T. Grant Foundation will permit an extensive, in-depth evaluation of these efforts. Operating funds come from four sources: the Ford Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Robert Sterling Clark Foundation, and the Florence V. Burden Foundation.

****

The remainder of this report includes a description of the project's development, the program components, and an analysis of our progress to date, as follows:

Project Development

Problem Statement and Background
Scottish Children's Hearings System

Program Organization

Operations and Staff
Panel Members
Mediation Process

Cases to Date

How Cases Come to the Project
Case Data and Outcomes
Court Diversion
Research

Case Histories and Sample Agreements

****

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Problem Statement and Background

In 1973, the Massachusetts legislature enacted a law which transferred services for status offenders from the youth correctional system (the Department of Youth Services) to the social services system. Although the law's intent was to decriminalize the offenses of truancy, running away, and incorrigibility (in Massachusetts, "stubborn child"), the statute permits arrests of runaways, and the use of bail and detention.

Observation of court proceedings involving status offenders (Children in Need of Services or CHINS, as compared to delinquents) indicates that the vast majority are there because their parents have brought them there. It appears that non-criminal misbehavior is rooted in complex family problems rather that the single-minded willfulness of a child. Nevertheless, the child is brought to court in the equivalent role of a defendant, usually in an opposing position to his or her parents. The child's behavior is the focus of an adversarial proceeding and despite the potential consequences to the child--most notably, the loss of freedom--he or she often plays a very minor role in the proceedings.

In abuse and neglect cases as well, an adversarial hearing is required to determine the basis and extent of social service intervention. The increase in court proceedings relating to child protection matters is partly due to the wide acceptance of the notion that court sanctions are required to enforce social service plans or to initiate them in the first place.

Status offender cases and abuse and neglect cases not only put an increased burden on the courts, but present a critical issue as to whether so many of these cases belong before the court in the first place. Although the goal of court intervention is to protect the child, recent concern focuses on how harmful these interventions can be for the child and family, and how often the most intrusive measures of care, i.e., placement and removal of children from parental custody, are imposed.

This concern is substantiated by the experience in Massachusetts for both CHINS and abuse and neglect cases. In 1979, 53 percent of CHINS youth referred to the Department of Welfare by the courts were initially placed outside the home in foster care or shelters. And of all CHINS youth receiving services from this Department, 61 percent were placed in long-term care. A study of abuse and neglect cases shows that in nearly half of these cases children had been placed in foster care and that 50 percent of these children remained there on a long-term basis.

In this context the Children's Hearings Project was created as an alternative to an adversarial process. Mediation is a forum where parents and children participate equally and gain confidence in their own abilities to confront family crisis and work toward effective, creative solutions. Youths and their families are referred to the project by judges, truant and probation officers, and other social service workers in a last attempt to resolve the situation, sometimes before bringing the matter to court, but at least in an effort to avoid progressing further into the court system.

Because various dispute resolution programs in this country had dealt only tentatively with juvenile matters, the Scottish system, already in existence for ten years, was a significant influence in developing our own model.

Scottish Children's Hearings System

In 1968 by an Act of Parliament, the juvenile justice system in Scotland changed drastically. The Children's Hearings System was established, relying heavily on community volunteers and social workers in accordance with the philosophy that most juvenile offenders need assistance, not punishment. Instead of coming to court, youthful offenders and their families appear before a three-person volunteer panel in an informal setting.

Recruited and trained by professionals, the panel members hear the cases and help families to make decisions on the needs of the youngsters involved. Dispositional decisions of the panel members are implemented by the staff of the Social Work Department, a governmental agency. Where facts have been disputed or where the events involve public protection, juvenile cases (about 10%) are heard in the Sheriff's Court.

In testing the applicability of the Scottish system to our own cases, it was neither possible nor desirable to replicate all aspects. We have modified some aspects and believe we have improved upon others. The most important distinctions relate to the fact that the Scottish system is government financed and has broad enforcement powers in requiring families to participate in the process and in requiring the Social Work Department to comply with decisions made at a hearing. Our program relies on voluntary compliance from families and on our own advocacy techniques in obtaining services from agencies. We believe we have strengthened the integrity of the informal process itself and broadened its scope by incorporating the principles of dispute resolution.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Operations and Staff

Families are referred to the Children's Hearings Project by the courts, the schools, or other social service agencies, including the State Department of Social Services. Upon referral, one of two case coordinators arranges to meet the family, describes the project, and seeks voluntary participation from both the child and the parents and any other person involved. This could include a school official, social worker or counselor, or a family friend or relative. After the family agrees to participate, the coordinator gathers preliminary information and sets a time for the hearing.

Hearings are scheduled within two weeks of the initial contact with the family. At the hearing, the community volunteers mediate among the parties present. Their goal is a balanced, written agreement in which all the parties--parents, children, and others--take responsibility for future actions. In some cases, a second hearing is scheduled.

After the hearing, the case coordinator monitors the agreement, usually by telephone, and follows up by linking the family to services to which they have agreed. Not all agreements call for social services.

Panel Members

Our panel members are our greatest asset. They range in age from young adult to senior citizen and they are representative of the various ethnic communities--Portuguese, Black, Hispanic, Haitian--in the project's geographical area. There are teachers, social workers, artisans, secretaries, managers, lawyers, and students. Age, sex, ethnicity, and experience are factors taken into consideration when matching panel members to families. Youth members in particular engender a greater degree of trust and responsiveness from the children participating in mediation. Each panel member has made a commitment to do one hearing a month (several do more) and each receives a ten dollar stipend to cover transportation and child care expenses.

Recruitment efforts have included outreach to housing projects, church groups, schools, social service agencies, and ethnic and youth organizations, advertisement in local newspapers, and presentations at community meetings. The first group of 27 volunteer panel members was trained in April, 1981 by the Crime and Justice Foundation, an agency with substantial experience in developing mediation programs.

A second group of twenty was recruited late in 1981 for a training which ended in February, 1982. The second training was conducted entirely by the staff and panel members from the first group. At the present time, there are forty active panel members.

Mediation Process

The hearing process consists of a series of "public" or "joint sessions" with all family members; "private sessions" with individuals; and "caucuses" of the panel members alone to discuss their approaches and strategies. During the initial joint session each party has an opportunity to speak and express his or her view of the problem. It is during the private sessions that family members, especially the youngsters, open up, giving new information and sharing their feelings and their hopes for the hearing. All family members may request that certain pieces of information be kept confidential from other family members if they wish.

Once information is gathered and the issues become clear, the panel members begin working on agreement points based on what family members say they want and will agree to. All agreement points are then checked with all the family members. If a hearing is successful in reaching agreement, it ends with a final public session where the agreement is read and signed by the family and panel members.

The types of issues addressed during the hearing range from specific ones, like curfews, to very broad ones, like the child's attitude about school or parents. It is not uncommon for family members to discuss background information, relationships with other people besides those at the hearing, previous marriages and divorces, other siblings, financial problems, and school problems. While a child's attitude or a parent's marital problem cannot be mediated, the information enables panel members to have a clearer, more complete picture of the family situation and thus guides and aides them toward agreement points which are realistic and important for a particular family.

Agreement points can cover many issues and might include, among others, chores, allowances, curfews, dating, school performance, punishment, family time together, yelling or nagging, going out, and job issues. While some agreement points might seem insignificant, they often are not. These are the issues that family members have brought to the hearing and which cause tension and fighting among them. If concrete and specific issues can be worked out, it can be the most significant step in reducing conflict within the family.

Throughout the hearing, panel members stress confidentiality. Family members are told that their remarks will not leave the hearing room and that information will not be passed on to referral sources. They are also told that a copy of the final agreement will be given to the court if a CHINS application has been filed. Any notes which panel members or family members take during the hearing are destroyed at the end.

The length of hearings varies from two to five hours. Initially, hearings averaged three to four hours, but recent hearings tend to be shorter, partly due to the panel members' experience and growing expertise. Additionally, a decision has been made that enables case coordinators to give more information to the panel members about the family prior to the hearing. This is consistent with the Scottish system. Panel members receive information about who family members are, the court status of the cases, the referral source, involvement with other agencies, school status, and extent of contact with the Children's Hearings Project. At the start of the hearing, all family members know what the panel members have been told.

The possibility of a second hearing is always an option either to review the first agreement or to discuss issues not addressed or agreed upon. (Please see end of report for sample agreements.)

CASES TO DATE

How Cases Come to the Project

At the present time, the majority of referrals come from

the two district courts in our geographical area--Cambridge and Somerville. Schools have become another major source of referral. Although we have met with the juvenile police officers, only one referral has come from the police department, and only a limited number of cases have been referred by the Department of Social Services. We remain optimistic about increasing social services referrals, and to meet this goal the project now receives referrals from the Waltham area office of the Department of Social Services as well as the Cambridge and Somerville offices. In order to provide this service in the Waltham community, we have recruited panel members and found a church site in Waltham at which to hold hearings.

Case Data and Outcomes

Of the 92 referrals received between May 21, 1981 and April 1, 1982, almost two-thirds (57) came from the courts. Schools, the Department of Social Services, and other agencies referred the remainder. Fifty-eight of the youngsters involved were girls and 34 were boys. Half of the cases referred to the project had no formal court appearance. Included in this number were seventeen cases referred by the courts at the earliest possible stage for diversion. The majority of cases were in the "Stubborn Child" category (incorrigible) of CHINS (47), while the others were divided among runaway (16), truant (24) and other types, such as protective (abuse and neglect) cases. (See chart next page.)

Fifty-one families have came to a panel hearing and ten more cases are scheduled for a hearing. In addition, seven families have had a second hearing and one family has had a third hearing, bringing the total number of hearings to 59. In many cases, a hearing has become unnecessary when a family crisis has been resolved through preliminary work with our project staff. Of the number of hearings held, 47 (80%) reached agreements of which 28 (60%) have held over the time they were monitored by the case coordinator.

Court Diversion

Even where agreements have not been reached, parents often withdraw their court complaints once the family has gone through the mediation process. Because the hearings have been particularly effective in school-initiated truancy cases--both in involving school officials and working out reasonable agreements for the child's school program--we are currently negotiating with the court to dismiss more of these cases. Liaison work with the judges and probation staff continues to be a crucial function of the project in order to achieve our goal of diverting cases from the court process.

The number of cases not returning to court is encouraging. In many of the cases not reaching agreement, we have recommended social services and facilitated a family's link to those resources.

Outcome By Referral Source			
	Referrals	Hearings Held	Agreements Reached
Court	57	42	33
School	11	5	5
Department of Social Services	10	5	4
Other	14	7	5
Total	92	59	47

Outcome By Type of Case			
	Referrals	Hearings	Agreements
Stubborn Child	47	33	25
Runaway	16	14	12
Truant	24	10	9
Other	5	2	1
Total	92	59	47

These statistics include all cases handled from May, 1981 through March 31, 1982.

When agreements break down completely, it usually happens within a brief period of time after a panel hearing. Most of these cases have stayed court-involved.

Research

In September, 1981, the project added a research component for evaluation and study of the hearings process. The research will focus on three areas--the applicability of the Scottish hearings system to children's cases in Massachusetts; a comparison of the Children's Hearings Project and the court process; and program evaluation.

****

We are encouraged by the early returns and the response of families to mediation. It appears that children and families view the hearings as a resource to help them resolve problems in a mutual way and not as a coercive power. The hearings have been designed to take the scrutiny and focus away from one party as the sole object of the proceedings and involve as equitably as possible all parties in the matter. It is evident that all participants recognize that they have an equal voice in explaining the facts, expressing personal views, and negotiating the terms of the agreement.

Our hopes for the project have been strengthened by the number of parents and children who have been willing to enter the unknown territory of mediation. A process which includes several hours of communication is indeed outside the experience of most families participating in the project. Nevertheless, we have almost no problem with people not showing up for their hearings once they have agreed to come. Even among those who may feel pressure to come because of a court referral, the majority freely express themselves and take on the responsibilities that mediated agreements stipulate.

ADDITIONAL
CASE HISTORIES
AND
SAMPLE AGREEMENTS

CASE HISTORY #2

Pete [redacted], 15, is assigned to a special school program which allows him to work at a daytime job and attend school from two to six p.m. His school guidance counselor suggested this alternative program when Pete had attendance problems in the regular high school program. Yet Pete continued to skip school and had no regular job.

Pete's mother reacted to his truancy by grounding Pete one week for each missed school day. She communicated with Mr. [redacted], the guidance counselor, by writing notes, since she worked full-time, was afraid to take time off, and was prohibited from making non-business phone calls at work.

Mr. [redacted] considered a court action in which he would file a CHINS application alleging truancy. However, he suggested to Pete and his mother that they might try the Children's Hearings Project and that this would be Pete's last chance before he went to court. Mrs. [redacted] agreed to try the mediation offered by the Project because it would take place in the evening.

When they arrived at the Project, Mrs. [redacted] looked very tired and said she would leave in an hour to attend a meeting at her daughter's school. In the first meeting with the mediators, she spoke of her lack of trust in Pete, her concern about his school attendance, and the fact that he destroyed notes sent to her by the guidance counselor. Pete, in turn, said he was in a no-win situation since--even if he attended school regularly--he could never work off the grounded time he had accumulated at home.

In the private sessions that followed, the mediators talked with Mrs. [redacted] about her grounding rules. Although she was impatient about Pete's school and worried about his getting into trouble, she was particularly concerned about a reliable accounting of his school attendance. When Pete spoke privately to the mediators, he agreed to go to school. Acknowledging that his mother had some reason not to trust him, Pete still complained about the grounding rules.

With the help of the Project's case coordinator who had been in touch with the school, the mediators worked with the Pedillos to come up with a written agreement with the following points: Pete would attend school; the coordinator would call the school daily for two weeks to check on the attendance; arrangements would be made after the two-week period for the school to contact the mother once a week; Mrs. [redacted] agreed to ground Pete only three days for each day of school missed.

The mediation session took two hours. After one hour Mrs. [redacted] announced that she would stay since it was so important. That statement influenced Pete who told the mediators that it showed that his mother was concerned for him and was not leaving to attend

Case History #2 Continued

his sister's school meeting.

After three months, Pete has not missed one day of school. He has a part-time job and has not been grounded. Both Mrs. [redacted] and Pete have said that mediation helped them to talk to each other which they now do when other difficulties arise.

CASE HISTORY #3

"I'm having a hell of a time," said the father of a truant daughter when he first met with the panel members at the Children's Hearings Project. Three months earlier Mr. [redacted] started caring for his three daughters alone when his ex-wife remarried and moved out of the family home. She did not want the children and Mr. [redacted] moved back in.

Overwhelmed with his new responsibilities but trying hard, the father soon faced a rebellious daughter who stopped going to school. After an argument with her dad about school and chores, Jean, 15, ran away and stayed with a friend for two weeks. Mr. [redacted] met with the school personnel and agreed that a CHINS truancy action should be initiated in court.

Because the school problems appeared related to the significant changes in the family, the judge referred the case to the Children's Hearings Project. The school guidance counselor also agreed to participate in the mediation sessions offered by the Project. Two mediation hearings were set up--one to discuss school-related problems, another for family issues.

Both Jean's mother and father attended the two sessions along with Jean's younger sister. Aware of the family crisis, they all worked hard to reach an agreement that would support each other. In the first hearing, the guidance counselor agreed to initiate a special education evaluation the next day and ease up on strict attendance monitoring if Jean attended school regularly. Because Jean agreed to improve her school and attendance performance, Mr. [redacted] agreed to buy her some cowboy boots. Jean has attended school regularly since the first mediation session.

The second mediation agreement outlined responsibilities for household chores. Jean's 13-year-old sister actively participated in this mediation and agreed to share chores. Looking back on their participation in the project, Jean and her father agreed that the mediations had "organized everything."

Agreement for CASE HISTORY at the beginning of the report.
FIRST HEARING

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT
of the MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER
497 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
Phone: (617) 661-4700

AGREEMENT
SAMPLE

Parent(s): Mrs. Elizabeth [redacted] _____

Child: Laureen [redacted]

Other: _____ **(relationship:** _____**)**

We have taken part in a hearing session on Jan. 12, 1982 **and have agreed to the following terms and conditions:** (DATE)

1. Both parties agree Laureen will begin visits home each weekend beginning January 15th.
2. Both parties agree visiting will begin at 6pm on Friday and last until Sunday afternoon.
3. Laureen agrees to arrange for transportation to and from home.
4. Mrs. [redacted] agrees that the family will participate in one special activity together each weekend.
5. Laureen agrees to a 10pm curfew when staying within the Somerville area. If activities are farther away, Laureen will get permission from her mother to attend.
6. Both parties agree to return to mediation on February 10, 1982

_____

We agree the above represents a fair and reasonable settlement and further agree to follow its terms and conditions.

Signature of Parties: Laureen [redacted] _____

Mrs. Elizabeth [redacted] _____

WITNESSED

We the undersigned panel members have heard these parties resolve their differences. We have witnessed the agreement signed above.

Signature of Panel Members: Louise C. _____ **(Chairperson)**

John R. _____

Ellen L.

Agreement for CASE HISTORY at the beginning of the report.

SECOND HEARING

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT

of the MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER
497 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
Phone: (617) 661-4700

AGREEMENT

SAMPLE

Parent(s): Mrs. Elizabeth [redacted] _____

Child: Laureen [redacted]

Other: _____ **(relationship:** _____**)**

We have taken part in a hearing session on February 10, 1982 **and have agreed to the following terms and conditions:** (DATE)

1. Both Mrs. [redacted] and Laureen agree that Laureen will come home by 10:30 on Friday and Saturday and 9:00 P.M. on Sunday. [redacted]een will let her mother know where she is when she is out.
2. Laureen and Mrs. [redacted] will speak with the Case Coordinator about counseling for Laureen.
3. Laureen and Mrs. Smith agree to continue spending time together and talking together

We agree the above represents a fair and reasonable settlement and further agree to follow its terms and conditions.

Signature of Parties: Mrs. Elizabeth [redacted] _____

Laureen [redacted] _____

WITNESSED

We the undersigned panel members have heard these parties resolve their differences. We have witnessed the agreement signed above.

Signature of Panel Members: Louise C. **(Chairperson)**

John R.

Ellen L.

CASE HISTORY #2

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT

of the MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER
497 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
Phone: (617) 661-4700

AGREEMENT

SAMPLE

Parent(s): Mrs. Barbara [redacted] _____

Child: Pete [redacted]

Other: _____ (relationship: _____)

We have taken part in a hearing session on November 12, 1981 (DATE) and have agreed to the following terms and conditions:

1. Pete agrees to attend all classes in the after school program on a regular basis.
2. Mrs. [redacted] agrees to lift grounding if Pete attends on a regular basis.
3. Pete and Mrs. Pedillo agree that grounding is lifted as soon as the Case Coordinator works out the means of monitoring Pete's school attendance.
4. Mrs. [redacted] and Pete understand that for each day Pete misses classes in school he will receive three days of weekday grounding.

We agree the above represents a fair and reasonable settlement and further agree to follow its terms and conditions.

Signature of Parties: Mrs. Barbara [redacted] _____

Pete [redacted] _____

WITNESSED

We the undersigned panel members have heard these parties resolve their differences. We have witnessed the agreement signed above.

Signature of Panel Members: Janelle A. _____ (Chairperson)

Ronald B. _____

_____

CASE HISTORY #3
FIRST HEARING

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT

of the MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER
497 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
Phone: (617) 661-4700

AGREEMENT

SAMPLE

Parent(s): Mr. [redacted] Mrs. [redacted] (mother)

Child: Jean [redacted] [redacted] (sister)

Other: [redacted] **(relationship:** Guidance Counselor

We have taken part in a hearing session on Nov. 24, 1981 **and have agreed to the following terms and conditions:** (DATE)

1. Ms. [redacted] agrees to initiate a Special Education evaluation on Nov. 25, 1981.

2. Mr. [redacted] and Jean agree to participate in the Special Education evaluation.

3. Jean agrees to continue the verification of attendance process until Monday, January 18, 1982. On January 18, 1982, she will begin to attend all classes without verification; if after the two weeks she has attended without cuts, verification process will be ended after second two weeks' review.

4. Second hearing scheduled for December 16, 1981 at 7 P.M.

5. Mr. [redacted] agrees to buy jeans cowboy boots before Christmas.

We agree the above represents a fair and reasonable settlement and further agree to follow its terms and conditions.

Signature of Parties: Jean [redacted] Mr. Thomas [redacted]

Ms. Angela [redacted] Mrs. Marie [redacted]

WITNESSED

We the undersigned panel members have heard these parties resolve their differences. We have witnessed the agreement signed above.

Signature of Panel Members: Joan W. **(Chairperson)**

Odelaine T.

Keith M.

CASE HISTORY #3
SECOND HEARING

THE CHILDREN'S HEARINGS PROJECT

of the MASSACHUSETTS ADVOCACY CENTER
497 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141
Phone: (617) 661-4700

AGREEMENT

SAMPLE

Parent(s): Mr. Thomas [redacted] Mrs. Marie [redacted] (mother)

Child: Jean [redacted] Ellen [redacted] (sister)

Other: _____ **(relationship:** _____**)**

We have taken part in a hearing session on Dec. 16, 1981 **and have agreed to the following terms and conditions:** (DATE)

1. Ellen will do the following chores daily: kitchen table, woodwork and fridge, put dishes away, kitchen floor and pantry, dry clothes, own room.

2. Jean will do the following chores daily: stove, wash dishes, Dad's floor, fold and sort clothes (as needed), own room.

3. Dad will do the following chores: food shopping, laundry, his own room, clean the bath 3 times a week.

4. Jean and Ellen will write up a schedule to divide equally cleaning the cat box and feeding the cat daily.

5. If Jean does not keep her end of the agreement she will stay home one day in the next weekend.

6. If Ellen does not keep her end of the agreement she will stay home the next Friday.

7. If Mr. [redacted] does not keep his end of the agreement he will stay home the following Saturday and Sunday night.

Agreement continued on next page:

We agree the above represents a fair and reasonable settlement and further agree to follow its terms and conditions.

Signature of Parties: Jean [redacted] Ellen [redacted]

Mr. Thomas [redacted] Mrs. Marie [redacted]

WITNESSED

We the undersigned panel members have heard these parties resolve their differences. We have witnessed the agreement signed above.

Signature of Panel Members: Keith M. **(Chairperson)**

Joan W.

(Agreement Continued)

CASE HISTORY #3
SECOND HEARING

8. Jean and Ellen agree not to borrow the other's belongings unless they ask beforehand. Each has a right to turn the other down if she so desires.

9. Jean agrees to allow Ellen to use their father's stereo in the event of a disagreement as to which channel to listen to.

10. Each person has the right to not do their chores once a week (but never twice in a row).

For Office Use Only
Record No._____
Referral Date _____
Case Coordinator _____

PANEL MEMBERS

Jannelle Amazeen
Judy Auerbach
Manuel Batista
Ronald James Blake
Carmen Chico
Louise Collier
Aida Colon
Rose Dobosz
Denise Ebacher-King
Diane Ellaborn
Matthew Engel
Jesse Fillman
Richard Gordon
Judith A. Hyatt
Nicholas LaFleur
Nancy Lazarus
Ellen Lynch
Sr. Christina MacLean
Lisa Medeiros
Julia Meehan
Keith Merron
Kathleen Monahan
Debra Morris
Scott Nathan
Bonnie Nessanbaum
John A. Nunziato
Joseph Orcel
Bruce Patton
W. Patrick Phear
Catherine Queen
Kathy Savage
Alberta Sills
Grayce W. Stead
Randi Storm
Terry Szpak
Odelaine Themistocle
Lillian Thomas
Hap Tierney
William Velez
Joan Whitaker
Constance Yee
Geraldine Zetzel

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Florence V. Burden Foundation
The Robert Sterling Clark Foundation
The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
The Ford Foundation
William T. Grant Foundation